REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-13 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicants are amending claims 1, 5, 10, and 12. No new claims have been added. As a result, claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-13 are pending for examination with claims 1 and 5 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action stated that none of the prior art references considered disclose a polarizing eyeglass device adaptable for use with a first type and a third type of stereoscopic image display apparatus with the detailed arrangements set forth in the claims, and the polarizing eyeglass device having a first and second arrangement with the details set forth in the claims such that by reversing the eyeglass device between first and second arrangements and by switching between the first and third type of display apparatus the stereoscopic image viewing can be preserved (Office Action, page 5).

The Office Action further stated that none of the prior art references considered disclose a polarizing eyeglass device adaptable for use with a second type and a fourth type of stereoscopic image display apparatus with the detailed arrangements set forth in the claims, and the polarizing eyeglass device having a third and fourth arrangement with the details set forth in the claims such that by reversing the eyeglass device between third and fourth arrangements and by switching between the second and fourth type of display apparatus the stereoscopic image viewing can be preserved (Office Action, page 5-6).

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of the allowed subject matter on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action. Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 10, and 11, accordingly, so as to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT publication WO 95/00872 ("Rosenswaig"). Although Applicants do not necessarily concede that the rejection is proper, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 10, and 11,

on the basis of the subject matter allowed by the Office Action, such that withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Nowhere does Rosenswaig teach or suggest whereby reversing the polarizing eyeglass device between the first and second arrangement and switching between the first and third type of display apparatus, respectively, preserves stereoscopic image viewing, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Rosenswaig and is believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 5

Nowhere does Rosenswaig teach or suggest whereby reversing the polarizing eyeglass device between the first and second arrangement and switching between the first and third type of display apparatus, respectively, preserves stereoscopic image viewing.

Accordingly, claim 5 patentably distinguishes over Rosenswaig and is believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 depend from claim 5 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: ξ -22-00

x8/25/06x

Respectfully submitted,

Randy J. Pritzker

Registration No.: 35,986

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza 600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

(617) 646-8000